



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/828,419	04/20/2004	Alfred Berchielli	PC25684A	5347

28880 7590 03/30/2007
WARNER-LAMBERT COMPANY
2800 PLYMOUTH RD
ANN ARBOR, MI 48105

EXAMINER

AHMED, HASAN SYED

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1615

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	03/30/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/828,419	Applicant(s) BERCHIELLI ET AL.	
	Examiner Hasan S. Ahmed	Art Unit 1615	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 December 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 18-30 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 and 12-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 8-11 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>6/19/04, 2/24/05, and 5/26/05</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Receipt is acknowledged of applicants': (a) response to the restriction requirement, which was filed on 21 December 2006; (b) IDS, which was filed on 16 June 2004; (c) supplemental IDS, which was filed on 23 February 2005; and (d) second supplemental IDS, which was filed on 26 May 2005.

* * * * *

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election without traverse of Group I in the reply filed on 21 December 2006 is acknowledged.

Claims 18-30 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to nonelected inventions, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on 21 December 2006.

* * * * *

Claim Objections

Claims 8-11 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim should refer to other claims in the alternative only. See MPEP § 608.01(n). Accordingly, the claims have not been further treated on the merits.

* * * * *

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-3, 5-7, 13, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Wilson, et al. (WO 99/36060).

Wilson, et al. disclose an oral dosage form (see page 1, lines 10-19). The dosage form is comprised of:

- the atorvastatin prepared without a granulation step of instant claim 1 (see page 5, line 28; examples 1-39);
- the excipient of instant claim 3 (see page 7, lines 7-24);
- the less than about 5% alkalizing agent additive of instant claim 5 (see page 10, lines 18-22; examples 1-39);
- the less than about 5% alkaline earth metal salt additive of instant claim 6 (see examples 1-39);
- the less than about 5% polymeric amide or polymeric amine additive of instant claim 7 (see examples 1-39);
- the greater than about 50 wt% of a diluent (polyethylene glycol) of instant claim 13 (see examples 1-20); and
- the at least one active drug in addition to the atorvastatin of instant claim 17 (see page 3, line 23).

Art Unit: 1615

The use of a capsule filler or tablet press recited in instant claim 2 is not essential to a determination of patentability of the composition disclosed in the claim. As explained by the court in *In re Thorpe et. al.* (CAFC 1985) 779 F2d 695, "A claim to a composition defined by reference to the process by which it is produced, is not limited to compositions produced by the process recited in the claim."

The Wilson, et al. reference is silent with respect to potency, as recited in instant claim 1. Applicants' composition contains the same components in the same configuration as the prior art. Properties are the same when the structure and composition are the same. Thus, burden shifts to applicant to show unexpected results, by declaration or otherwise. *In re Fitzgerald*, 205 USPQ 594. In the alternative, the claimed properties would have been present once the composition was employed in its intended use. *In re Best*, 195 USPQ 433.

* * * * *

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 4, 12, 14, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilson, et al. (WO 99/36060) in view of Kerc, et al. (WO 02/072073).

Wilson, et al. disclose an oral dosage form (see above).

Art Unit: 1615

Wilson, et al. explain that their dosage form is beneficial because it results in an enhanced rate and degree of absorption of a pharmaceutically active agent, while minimizing gastric irritation (see page 1, lines 10-14).

Wilson, et al. do not explicitly disclose the somewhat disordered (amorphous) forms of atorvastatin recited in instant claim 4, however these forms were known in the pharmaceutical art at the time the instant application was filed (see Kerc, et al., abstract; page 5, lines 12-16; tables 1 and 4; page 10, lines 8-13; and examples 1-6).

While Wilson, et al. do not explicitly teach the segregation numbers of instant claims 12 and 15 or the mean particle diameter of instant claim 14, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to determine suitable segregation and particle diameter routine or manipulative experimentation to obtain the best possible results, as these are variable parameters attainable within the art.

Moreover, generally, differences in segregation or particle diameter will not support the patentability of subject matter encompassed by the prior art unless there is evidence indicating such concentration is critical. "[W]here the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation." *In re Aller*, 220 F.2d 454, 456; 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955). Applicants have not demonstrated any unexpected or unusual results, which accrue from the instant segregation number or particle diameter.

Wilson, et al. do not explicitly teach the diluents of instant claim 16 (e.g. microcrystalline cellulose). Rather, they teach use of the diluents

Art Unit: 1615

hydroxypropylmethylcellulose and hydroxypropylcellulose (see page 7, lines 14-16). Because microcrystalline cellulose, hydroxypropylmethylcellulose and hydroxypropylcellulose are all carbohydrate-based dispersing agents, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to add microcrystalline cellulose, hydroxypropylmethylcellulose or hydroxypropylcellulose to the instant composition. There is a reasonable expectation that the addition of microcrystalline cellulose, hydroxypropylmethylcellulose or hydroxypropylcellulose to the instant composition would provide an effective diluent. As such, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add either microcrystalline cellulose, hydroxypropylmethylcellulose or hydroxypropylcellulose to the instant composition.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to disclose a unit dosage form comprising a somewhat disordered form of atorvastatin without a granulation step, as taught by Wilson, et al. in view of Kerc, et al. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to make such a composition because it results in an enhanced rate and degree of absorption of a pharmaceutically active agent, while minimizing gastric irritation, as explained by Wilson, et al.

* * * * *

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory

Art Unit: 1615

obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

*

1. Claims 1-17 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-22 of copending Application No. 10/828,398 ('398). Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because '398 claims a composition comprising atorvastatin (claim 1) in a disordered form (claim 7), with low levels of alkaline earth metal salt additive (claim 2).

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

*

2. Claims 1-17 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-12 of copending Application No. 10/828,079 ('079). Although the conflicting claims are not

Art Unit: 1615

identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because '079 claims a composition comprising atorvastatin (claim 1) in a disordered form (claim 3), with low levels of alkaline earth metal salt additive (claim 1).


This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

☆

Correspondence

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hasan S. Ahmed whose telephone number is 571-272-4792. The examiner can normally be reached on 9am - 5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael P. Woodward can be reached on 571-272-8373. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.


HUMERA N. SHEIKH
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Art Unit: 1615

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.
